

MEETING MINUTES FROM THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

August 5, 2015

Maricopa Association of Governments Office, Ironwood Room  
302 North First Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona

AGENCY MEMBERS

David Janover, Avondale, (proxy)	Lance Webb, Mesa
Craig Sharp, Buckeye	Dan Nissen, Peoria
Warren White, Chandler	Rob Duvall, Phoenix (Streets) (proxy)
Ruben Aguilar, El Mirage	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
* Wayne Costa, Florence	Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
Tom Condit, Gilbert	Kristin Tytler, Surprise
* Mark Ivanich, Glendale	Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Chair
* Tom Vassallo, Goodyear	Harvey Estrada, Valley Metro
Ed Williams, MCDOT (proxy)	* Gregory Arrington, Youngtown

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Jeff Benedict, ARPA	Jeff Hearne, ARPA
Arvid Veidmark, AZUCA	Peter Kandarlis, Independent (audio)
* Mike Sanders, AZUCA	* Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Brian Gallimore, AGC	* Jacob Rodriguez, SRP
Greg Groneberg, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

\* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

None.

1. Call to Order

Chair Tom Wilhite called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m.

Mr. Wilhite introduced Ed Williams who was filling in for Bob Herz of Maricopa County, David Janover, filling in for Jim Badowich of Avondale and Rob Duvall, substituting for Melody Moss of Phoenix.

2. Call to the Audience

No requests to speak were submitted.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the July 1, 2015 meeting minutes. Jami Erickson moved to accept the minutes as written. Kristin Tytler seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

**Carry Forward 2014 Cases**

Before getting to individual cases, Chair Wilhite made a few announcements. He said as they went through each case, he would like the sponsor to state whether they planned to vote on the case next month, withdraw it, or carry it forward to continue work next year. He also said that there was a conflict with the next September 2 committee meeting and the AWWA Conference. He asked if any members were at the conference, could they arrange a proxy to attend the MAG meeting. Kristin Tytler said she was planning to attend the conference, but should be able find a proxy to attend the committee meeting. No other members had this conflict.

4. Case 14-03: Updates to Guardrail Details – Revisions to Section 415 and/or include Guardrail Details.

Ed Williams read a message left by Bob Herz regarding this case. The details for the 31” guardrails were delayed because there was an issue with receiving the terminals. Maricopa County will continue to maintain the existing details (that are referenced in MAG) for now, and the case will be withdrawn next month.

5. Case 14-06: Revisions to Section 718 Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete.

Jeff Benedict said the case has been modified to address just the revisions to the text in the tables that updates the specs for current test procedures. He asked if there were any questions, and called for a vote on the case at the next meeting.

6. Case 14-12: Proposed Revisions to Sections 336, 321.10.3, 601.2.7, 601.2.10 and Detail 200-1.

*Add pavement removal criteria to prevent full depth pavement cuts from being located within a lane wheel path and to prevent creation of narrow pavement edge strips.* Ed Williams asked if there were any questions or comments on the case. Seeing none, Mr. Williams moved to accept the case as presented. Warren White seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 4 not present.

7. Case 14-17: Create New Section 322 - Asphalt Stamping.

Greg Groneberg said the case had a few minor revisions based on comments from the last meeting. “Stamping” was removed from the title of Table 322-1 since the materials can be used on non-stamped decorative pavement as well. Also removed was the reference to the number of application passes required, leaving it to the manufacturer’s recommendations. He asked that this case be voted on next month.

## **New Cases for 2015**

8. Case 15-01: Miscellaneous Corrections A-F.

Peter Kandarlis said he noticed that in Section 317 half of the word “Milling” was bold and suggested correcting this formatting error. Mr. Tyus said it would be corrected. Mr. Wilhite proposed to vote on all the corrections at the next meeting.

9. Case 15-03: Revise Section 601.4.5 Trench Final Backfill.

Ed Williams said Mr. Herz left a note stating that the only revision to the case in the packet was to remove the plasticity index requirement for native backfill material. He asked to vote on the case at the next meeting.

10. Case 15-05: Revise Section 616 Reclaimed Water Line Construction and Add New Reclaimed Valve Box Detail.

Warren White said that a manufacturing detail of the square box from Nenah Foundry was provided at the meeting last month. He said he could limit the case to just providing a new detail, which may be ready to vote on next month, but some specifications would still need to be updated. Sensing the committee did not feel an urgent need to complete the case this year, Mr. White proposed carrying the case forward to next year to allow time for review by the working group, and revision of related specifications.

11. Case 15-07: Revisions to Concrete Paver Standards for Non-Traveled Surfaces, Detail 225 and Section 342.

Warren White summarized that the main purpose of this case was to provide for placement of pavers in raised medians, where the base is compacted backfill rather than concrete as in the street. In the packet, Detail 225 has been updated, along with the latest revision to Section 342, both in marked-up and final versions. He noted titles have changed to refer to them as interlocking pavers.

He said he received and incorporated comments from Bob Herz of MCDOT including adding a contraction joint detail, and cleaning up the graphics using standard symbols such as that for ABC. The notes and abbreviations were also made consistent. For the updates to Section 342, Mr. White added verbiage for different paving materials. He asked for comments and said he wished to vote on the case next month.

Peter Kandarlis had a comment on page 3 of Section 342 regarding requirements about vibrating the pavers in place “using a vibrator capable of 3,000 to 5000 pounds compaction force.” He wondered if it was necessary to tell the contractor what compaction force or equipment should be used. Rod Ramos said they typically use plate compactors to level off the pavers. Mr. Kandarlis suggested deleting the highlighted text since the contractor still must meet the straight edge test for leveling required in the next paragraph. Mr. Wilhite asked if specifying the number of passes at 90 degrees was necessary either. Brian Gallimore said the contractor could make five passes – whatever is required. He thought this could also be deleted.

Jeff Hearne noted that the next sentence about the sand having 30%, 1/8” particles also didn’t make sense to include, since this is not how sand is measured in the materials spec. Craig Sharp noted there was a maximum of 1” sand layer, but wondered if there was a minimum. Rod Ramos said a minimum was not required; the sand’s purpose was for leveling.

Warren said he would take these comments and update the case with the intent of voting on it at the next meeting.

12. Case 15-09: Revisions to Section 321 Placement and Construction of Asphalt Concrete Pavement.

Jeff Benedict provided a new version of the case at the meeting. He said the front memo page highlighted the changes proposed for Section 321. The main change was removing the temperature table. Most of the other changes were minor revisions to clarify wording and intent of various sections. He asked members to take it back to their agencies for review. Mr. Benedict anticipated that this case would need more time for review, and plans to carry it forward into next year.

13. Case 15-10: Add Subsection 321.10.5.3 “Rehabilitation Work” into the MAG Specifications.

Brian Gallimore said there were a couple changes to the case. The first was adding language for compaction effort in Section 321.10.2. The main purpose of the case was to add language dealing with rehabilitation work. A new subsection 321.10.5.3 was added. There currently are two options shown in the case. The first is the language developed by industry, the second is language proposed by MCDOT that added more detail about what constitutes “questionable support characteristics.” Other than comments from MCDOT, Mr. Gallimore has not received feedback from other agencies, so he doesn’t know if it hasn’t been reviewed yet, or if there is no issue with the proposed change. He said if no one has any comments, he would like to call for a vote next month.

Tom Wilhite asked how they could vote on something with two different options. He said the final version would need to present the final specification. He also had concerns about a definition of rehabilitation work, and what all it would include. Brian Gallimore said industry felt it was when they did an overlay on an existing road, surface repair or patch. Greg Groneberg said contractors run into issues where there is a visual discrepancy in the base, but are told by the agency to pave it without correcting the base problem. Mr. Gallimore said the second paragraph tries to explain the criteria for when it applies. He said they proposed changing the compaction requirement from 8% to 10% for rehabilitation work. He said agencies now were requiring contractors to meet the 8% requirement even though they did not correct problems in the base material.

Craig Sharp said if you find questionable material you have to notify the agency, and then the agency can decide what to do. He said they had a similar problem in Buckeye. Mr. Gallimore said MAG doesn’t have any specs on what to do next. Rob Duval noted agencies don’t always have the funds to correct the base. Mr. Sharp said he didn’t think you should leave it to the contractor to decide what to do if there is a break-through or problem.

Mr. Gallimore explained why the 10% compaction requirement was picked – he thought it still provided a functional road, and is what is used now on Marshal mixes. He asked members to take the draft back to their jurisdiction review. He said he would talk to Bob Herz try and come up with a final revision before the next meeting, so it could still be scheduled for a possible vote.

14. Case 15-11: Incorporate revisions to Section 717, “Mix Design Requirements” into the MAG Specifications.

Greg Groneberg provided an update to the case (dated 7/28/15) at the meeting. He said he had correspondence with John Shi at Maricopa County to make final changes to the table. He said he was waiting for Mr. Shi to verify the changes, but believes the case

helps clarify how admixture is measured. He asked to vote on the case at the next meeting.

15. Case 15-12: New Section 608 HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILLING.

Arvid Veidmark said the most recent version (rev20) was provided in the packet. It incorporates changes requested by Cox Communications at the last working group meeting to break out the Bore Data and As Built as separate items in Table 608-2. He said there was also discussion about including the drawing as a figure in the text rather than a separate detail drawing since it is more illustrative than construction related. Peter Kandarisi suggested adding Figure number 608-1 and Harvey Estrada said it should be referenced in the text. Mr. Veidmark said he could make those changes.

Tom Wilhite asked about requirements for potholing. Mr. Veidmark said the blue stake law mandated potholing requirements, and he thought these did not need to be repeated in the spec. Mr. Wilhite was more concerned about how potholing would be done in relation to agency inspection. Warren White said the potholing results would be shown on the bore plan. Peter Kandarisi asked if it doesn't meet clearances than what would you do? Mr. Veidmark said he could add a paragraph in the 608.5.4 construction section on what to do if the 1' separation is not met. Mr. Wilhite said they require greater separation than 1' on some utilities, and would like to change some of the minimum separation requirements. Harvey Estrada noticed that in the title of Section 608.2 there is a typo, it should be HDD instead of HHD. Arvid Veidmark said he believed Jim Badowich wanted to try and vote on this case this year, so proposed a vote at the next meeting.

Next Mr. Veidmark gave a short presentation on horizontal directional drilling, explaining the basic process and capabilities. This presentation is posted on the MAG website here: <http://www.azmag.gov/Events/Event.asp?CMSID=7016>

16. Case 15-13: Add text to Section 725.6 to Identify what to Include in a Concrete Mix Design Submittal.

Jeff Hearne said he needed more discussion with agencies about changing the aggregate variation from 5% to 10% before requiring a new design submittal. In order to address these concerns he proposed carrying the case forward into next year.

17. Case 15-14: Revise Sections 321 and 325 to coordinate overlay work requirements.

Ed Williams said a new revision was included in the packet. He asked for comments from the committee and requested to vote on the case at the next meeting.

Brian Gallimore said he had a concern with language MCDOT added regarding the removal of thermoplastic markings and pavement markers. He said as far as he was aware, only MCDOT removed them before milling, so he wasn't sure other agencies would want this in the spec since removing thermoplastic markings can be expensive

and time consuming. It is a separate work item and should be compensated as such. Peter Kandarlis said contractors need know what to remove to estimate costs. Rob Duval said he was not in favor of adding this to the spec. Mr. Gallimore said on full milling they are typically milled up with the asphalt, but when edge milling, you may need to fix the unmilled portion of the symbol. Tom Wilhite asked if it could be made an agency choice. Rob Duval said Phoenix does lump sums for milling paid per square yard inch. Mr. Ramos suggested a separate spec for line or symbol removal. Mr. Gallimore said blasting with a pressure washer is another method of removal. Mr. Williams said he would talk to Bob Herz about this issue, but still would like it on the agenda next month for possible action.

## 18. Working Group Reports

Chair Wilhite asked for reports from the working group chairs.

### a. **Curb Ramp Working Group**

Warren White said they are still ramping up with the second meeting of the group. They are initially focused on dual ramps. The group looked at Peoria details and the city of Chicago package, although Chicago details often had tight radii and were designed for more urban environments. He said there is also the issue that PROWAG recommendations are still in draft format, but do show options for directional and aligned dual ramps. The group is looking to create details for both options. A draft detail that modified Detail 235 to include dual ramps is in progress. The next meeting is scheduled for August 10 at 1:00 in the MAG Cottonwood room.

### b. **Water/Sewer Issues Working Group**

Jim Badowich was not present to give a report, but notes from the meeting were included in the packet. The next Water/Sewer Working Group meeting is scheduled for August 20, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG Cottonwood room.

### c. **Asphalt/Materials Working Groups**

Jeff Benedict said they reviewed all current cases at the last meeting, but want to focus on preparing a final version of Case 15-10 for rehabilitation work at the next meeting, so he encouraged agency members to attend. Mr. Gallimore agreed that they are looking for final direction on this case. The meeting is scheduled for August 27, 2015 at noon at the APRA offices.

### d. **Concrete Working Group**

Jeff Hearne said there was no meeting last month, and since he plans to carry forward Case 15-13 to next year, he does anticipate any meetings until next January.

e. **Outside ROW Working Group**

Peter Kandarlis said he sent a letter to the Geo Institute to ask for help in reviewing MAG specs. He received half a dozen responses and believes they can help with specs and details for underground retention tanks, and reviewing the existing MAG geotextile specifications.

19. General Discussion

Tom Wilhite said he and a few other agency members met with Anne Reichman from the ASU Global Institute of Sustainability. They were looking for how MAG specifications and details could be used to promote sustainable development projects. Gordon Tyus said they discussed the sustainable development toolkit developed by Mesa, and said they were hoping MAG could develop specs and details such as curb cuts to allow drainage into natural retention basins. Tom Wilhite said he informed them that MAG was also developing pervious concrete specs. Mr. Tyus said ASU's sustainable construction subgroup membership was going to review agency supplements that may be applicable.

Gordon Tyus said according to MAG policies, next year Jim Badowich would ascend to chair of the committee, and so the committee will need to appoint a new vice chair. He said a memo outlining how to submit a letter of interest to the MAG Regional Council Chair, as well as sample previous letters were provided. He said MAG encouraged geographic balance so interested members representing parts of the east valley were encouraged to submit a letter.

20. Future Agenda Items

Harvey Estrada said Valley Metro would be interested in helping to develop a detail for a bus stop pad that Mr. Tyus mentioned at the last meeting. Mr. Tyus said MAG is developing a project to help fund standardized bus stops, and thinks it would be helpful to have a standard detail in MAG, since several agencies already have a supplemental detail.

21. Adjournment:

Seeing no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:21 p.m.